# Some Factors that Retard or Accelerate the Rate of Acculturation

## With Specific Reference to
## Hungarian Immigrants

### S. ALEXANDER WEINSTOCK

## INTRODUCTION[1]

THIS STUDY attempts to assess some of the factors that retard or accelerate the rate of acculturation of Hungarian immigrants in the United States.

The Hungarians have a long history of immigration to the United States, the first wave appearing in the early half of the eighteenth century (Brown & Roucek, 1946, p. 213). The bulk of the Hungarian settlers, however, came between 1871 and 1913 (Lengyel, 1948). The revolution of 1956, a reaction against the life under the Communist regime, led to a mass flight from Hungary, as a result of which 40,000 refugees were admitted to the United States (Swing, 1960). This study is concerned with the later group: those refugees arriving after 1956.

At present, there are numerous approaches to the study of acculturation ranging from the historical to the psychoanalytic. Each approach has its advantages and limitations. One might approach the problem by studying the Hungarian group in relation to another ethnic group assimilating in the United States, such as the Poles or the Jews. Such an approach would place emphasis primarily on group behavior, and it would not necessarily provide adequate data on the individual undergoing the acculturation experience. The emphasis of this study is upon the individual. He is evaluated here in terms of intragroup rather than intergroup comparisons. Thus, this is not a study of either the Hungarian or the American sociocultural system; rather, it is a study of behavior as it occurs in its socio-cultural context, in terms of role theory and in the light of the internal, subjective patterning of these phenomena (Allport, 1960). The national context is of concern, of course, but only in terms of the extent to which the individual immigrant experiences it and reacts to it.

Time is undoubtedly an important factor in the study of assimilation. Because members of this group arrived at the same time, but were interviewed after varying lengths of stay in the United States, it was possible to test the relationship between the amount of time spent in the United States and the degree of assimilation, as well as the relationship between time and other factors.

321

PREVIOUS STUDIES

Among the many summaries of the acculturation literature, the most comprehensive are by Grauman (1951), Keesing (1953), Lindt (1955), and Spiro (1955). On the basis of these reviews, the following conclusions are suggested:

*A.* The term 'acculturation' is not used with any consistency. Some writers use the terms 'assimilation', 'accommodation', 'absorption', 'cultural integration', 'social acceptance', 'convergence of norms', 'self-identification', etc., to denote the concept here called 'acculturation' (Weinstock, 1960).

*B.* With some important exceptions, such as Hallowell (1955), Spindler (1955), Taft (1957), Doob (1960), and Segall (1961), most of the work on acculturation has been done by anthropologists and a few sociologists who have neglected the psychological dimension of the process (Singer, 1961, p. 41). Those few studies using psychological variables often rely on the use of the projective techniques, which have limited validity (Doob, 1960, pp. 60–6).

*C.* In most of the reported research no effort has been made to measure quantitatively the concept of acculturation. There are, however, a few exceptions, for instance Mead (1926) and Hoffman (1934), who have used indices of bilingualism as measures of acculturation. Though measures of bilingualism yield adequate quantitative measurement, they do not indicate fully the extent to which a person clings to his foreign background; Doob (1960) uses the single index of education as a measure of 'civilization', a criterion that is subjected to similar criticism by Segall (1961).

Another quantitative measure is the scale developed by Ruesch, Loeb, and Jacobson (1948). This scale is based on the concept of 'culture distance from the American core culture'. Although there may be an American 'core culture', there is, as yet, no quantitative way of defining it. Moreover, it may be erroneous to study cultures in terms of dominant values, since a culture consists of many different subcultures (Caudill & de Vos, 1956). There are also numerous individuals in the United States who do not subscribe to many dominant values, but who are nevertheless American (Maslow, 1951).

A scale of acculturation that has managed to overcome most of these difficulties has been developed by Campisi (1947). The Campisi Scale is a self-descriptive inventory in which a person describes the extent to which he conforms to the American ways of life and the degree to which he has maintained his former ways. It is not concerned with measuring the component dimensions of the American or the ethnic culture but simply the degree of conformity to the former. Although the scale has a very high validity, it is subject to the criticism that it might be distorted by the respondent. Since the Campisi Scale was used in this study, it is discussed in detail later on in this paper.

DEFINITION OF ACCULTURATION

For the purposes of this study, acculturation is defined as the process of becoming more American-like. Acculturation is conceived of as a process whereby an individual moves from an idealized Hungarian pole of a theoretical continuum toward an idealized American pole. The process can be measured in terms of changing attitudes, behaviors, values, and certain personality factors.

Because this study is social-psychological, acculturation is conceived as a one-way process, contrary to Linton's (1936, p. 353) use of the term. In this study the immigrant is perceived of as in the process of change, while the culture is perceived as static. Of course it is true that cultures are in a constant state of movement and immigrants effect changes in the host culture over a period of time, but, from the point of view of the immigrant, he is the one who adjusts to the culture.

## THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

We shall seek to interpret some of the present findings within the theoretical framework of role theory. The examination of this problem involves an evaluation and extension of existing concepts. For the purposes of clarity, a number of terms need definition. All relevant behavior takes place within the context of the social system. *Status* is a position within the social system involving designated rights and obligations. *Role* refers to behavior oriented to the patterned expectations of others (Linton, 1936).

Merton (1957) introduced, as an extension of this theory, the concept of role-set. He begins with the premise that each social status 'involves not a single associated role, but an array of roles' called the role-set. In other words, role-set designates 'the complement of role relationships in which persons are involved by virtue of occupying a particular status'. For example, 'The status of medical student entails not only the role of a student *vis-à-vis* his teachers, but also an array of other roles relating him diversely to other students, physicians, nurses, social workers, medical technicians and the like.'

It is suggested here that the idea of the role-set should be extended to include the concept of role element. *Role elements* are the specific behavior patterns that are expected of the status holder by the different members of the role-set. For example, the status of a schoolteacher implies not only expectations of a distinctly pedagogical nature on the part of pupils, colleagues, the Board of Education, and other members of the role-set, but also numerous expectations peripheral to pedagogy as such, but nonetheless an integral part of the role definition. For example, the pupils will not only expect the teacher to teach, but will also expect him to wear shoes, to speak English, to maintain discipline, etc. These two kinds of expectation could be designated as *central* and *peripheral* elements. The central elements consist of the strictly occupational requirements. The peripheral elements designate the non-technical requirement of the status. Occupations vary in the ratio of central to peripheral elements and also in the total number of elements they require. All the members of a role-set have both central and peripheral expectations from the occupant of a particular status. All of these expectations make up the role elements—which in turn define the role.

Occupations can also be ranked according to prestige, as Edwards (1943) and Hatt and North (1947) have shown. I suggest that, in general, *the higher the rank of an occupation on the prestige scale the more numerous, and the more specific, will be the number of role elements connected with that occupational status*. For example, if a man has the job of a sweeper in a large skyscraper, he will have only a few requirements for that position without concomitant demands made on him as to mode of dress, manner of speech, and general qualities of personality, or the possession of more than a minimal facility with English. In other words, his occupational status will involve a few well-defined central elements and almost no peripheral elements. For the position of an executive in a large corporation, on the other

hand, the peripheral elements will become correspondingly important in addition to being more numerous. It is a matter of common acceptance in the U.S.A. that personnel directors considering an applicant for a position as a junior executive interview the candidate's wife, see where he lives, observe how he behaves when entertaining, assess whether his children go to the 'right' schools, and so forth. This kind of consideration is certainly not brought to the hiring of a porter, in whose case the management does not usually care whether the sweeper belongs to any particular church, if his children attend school at all, or whether he dresses properly off the job.

Since the role elements in the United States are prescribed by Americans, and since acculturation was defined as the process of becoming an American, it is therefore proposed that the more numerous the role elements the occupant of the given status has to fulfill, the more American his behavior is going to become. Thus, the higher a person's position on the occupational scale, the more his behavior patterns are going to be prescribed for him if he wants to maintain his position—and, still more, if he seeks to advance it.

But one could elaborate even more, since industrial societies show 'an extremely high level of agreement . . . as to the relative prestige of a wide range of specific occupations' (Inkeles & Rossi, 1955). Thus one could generalize and state that an immigrant who had a high-prestige position in one industrialized society would acculturate faster in another industrialized society, provided his skill was transferable, than a person with a low-prestige position.

An example of this is shown in the comparison of two respondents, both of whom had approximately equal standing on the occupational-prestige scale in Hungary, but only one of whom was able to transfer his skill. The respondent who was a physician and a specialist in Hungary (the equivalent of a board member) was forced on coming to the United States to become a resident again; nevertheless, he spoke English at home, read American newspapers, dressed like an American physician, and was generally among the highest acculturated group. On the other hand, the second respondent, a lawyer, could not transfer his training, Hungarian jurisprudence being different from American, and so became a salesman. Though this respondent was also fluent in English, some of his clothing was still European and at home he spoke in Hungarian (both respondents had Hungarian wives, and both had known English in Hungary). He was in the middle acculturated group.

The theory of acculturation here proposed advances an explanation mainly in terms of the social system, because the concept of role elements emphasizes external demands rather than motivations. The process of acculturation is functional within the social framework, since one of the main functions of social systems is to assure cultural conformity and minimize conflict. American society in all likelihood would have disintegrated if the immigrants of the past one hundred years had not assimilated. This raises the question of how this societal goal is translated into individual motivation. Conformity to cultural norms is rarely the result of negative sanctions, but is most frequently achieved because social systems satisfy personality needs. Fromm (1947) makes the point clearly:

'In order that any society may function well, its members must acquire the kind of character which makes them *want* to act in the way they *have* to act as members of the society . . . They have to *desire* what objectively is necessary for them to do.'

One could say that individuals acculturate because they have 'a need for role-ship', that is, the need 'to become and to remain part of an accepted and respected, differentiated and integrated and functioning group, the collective purposes of which are congruent with the individual's ideals' (Murray & Kluckhohn, 1953, p. 19).

This still would not answer the question why individuals belonging to the higher occupational statuses find American society the one that is congruent with their ideals, whereas those belonging to lower statuses find the Hungarian group more congenial. To answer this question, one would have to know that the more acculturated groups had different needs and motivations, and that by becoming more acculturated they satisfied these strivings. It is hypothesized that individuals who are more acculturated are more achievement-oriented; that the more accultur-ated have a strong acquisitive value-orientation. One way to satisfy these needs is either to acquire or to maintain a high occupational status. As was pointed out previously, the social system works in such a fashion that, in order to acquire and maintain a high occupational status, it is necessary to acculturate.

## METHOD

### THE SAMPLE

A significant feature of this study is the nature of the sample. Most studies of acculturation deal with a local concentration of ethnics as the sample. Con-sequently, the sample selected for research often consists of people who, in effect, have failed to assimilate. Those people who acculturated most successfully moved out of the community and lost all visibility as ethnics. This difficulty is circumvented in the present study by the use of subjects selected at the time of their arrival in the country, and then located two years later for the study.

At the time of the arrival of the first immigrants in 1956, the Human Ecology Study Program at Cornell University Medical College embarked upon a program of medical research, using a group of seventy-six Hungarians as their sample, (Hinkle, 1958, p. 38). The major consideration guiding the selection of the sample was that it should be representative of the occupational structure of the recent Hungarian refugee population in the United States. A comparison with the two other major studies[2] dealing with Hungarian refugees shows that this objective was attained (Weinstock, 1958). In 1958, the author was offered access to the list of the original seventy-six respondents.

The respondents were traced to various parts of the United States between 1958 and 1959. From the original seventy-six, four had returned to Hungary. Of the remainder, fifty-three of those who were located on the Eastern seacoast (between Boston and Philadelphia in the south and between New York and Chicago in the west) were included in the study. Three respondents, though located in the area, refused to be reinterviewed. This relatively broad dispersal insured against selection on the basis of ethnic visibility, which is a frequent shortcoming of other studies. Therefore, it was expected that within this small group of respondents a wide range of acculturation scores would be obtained. Some of the demographic characteristics of the sample are given in *Table 1*.

2. Free Europe Committee and the Columbia University Research Project on Hungary.

Y

TABLE 1    DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

*Age of respondents at time of interview (n=50)*[a]

|  | % |
|---|---|
| Under 20 | 6 (3) |
| 21–35 | 60 (30) |
| 36–45 | 30 (15) |
| 46+ | 4 (2) |

*Sex (n=50)*

| Male | Female |
|---|---|
| 78% (39) | 22% (11) |

*Occupational status in Hungary as of 1956 (n=50)*

|  | % |
|---|---|
| Low status | 18 (9) |
| (unemployed, unskilled, farm, semi-skilled) |  |
| Middle status | 24 (12) |
| (skilled workers, clerical and sales, shopkeepers) |  |
| High status | 34 (17) |
| (owners, managers, professionals, graduate students) |  |
| Institutionalized | 12 (6) |
| Too young | 8 (4) |
| Other | 4 (2) |
| (includes housewives) |  |

*Occupational status in the United States at time of interview (n=50)*

|  | % |
|---|---|
| Low status | 22 (11) |
| Middle status | 34 (17) |
| High status | 34 (17) |
| Other | 10 (5) |

*Religion at the time of interview (n=51)*

|  | % |
|---|---|
| Roman Catholic | 52 (26) |
| Protestant | 34 (17) |
| Jewish | 16 (8) |

[a] The *n* in all tables is based on the questions answered rather than on the complete sample, because some respondents did not answer all questions.

This sample is in many respects similar to the other groups of post-revolution Hungarian refugees who have been studied. On the other hand, there are some differences between this sample and the pre-revolution groups. This sample is more highly educated, higher on the occupational prestige scale, and generally of a higher social class than any of the previous Hungarian refugee groups. The

higher socioeconomic status of the post-1956 Hungarian group is probably due to the high rate of industrialization under Communist rule (Wszelaki, 1957, p. 295). With rapid industrialization there was a concomitant change in values. As Inkeles (1960) has noted, industrialized countries have a great tendency to share certain common values. Therefore, the post-Communist Hungarians are in many ways likely to be more receptive to assimilation to American life than any previous Hungarian refugee group. Furthermore, it should be emphasized that if education and occupation are taken as measures of social mobility, the bulk of the sample was not downwardly mobile under the Communist regime. The contrary is true. The rapid industrialization of Hungary, as well as the expansion of the educational system, enabled most people either to maintain or to improve their past position. This view is supported by Stephenson and Schulman (1958).

## PROCEDURE

The respondents were selected and tested for the study in the following manner: as mentioned earlier, the respondents were initially subjects in the 1956 Cornell study. Between 1958 and 1959, a letter was sent, written in Hungarian, requesting their participation in a study of Hungarians in the United States.

Each respondent was interviewed for a total of six to eight hours. Wherever possible, the interviews were broken up into two or three sessions. The interview questionnaire was given in Hungarian or in English, depending on the respondent's preference. All the attitude scales, including the measures for acculturation, were self-administered in their Hungarian version in the presence of the investigator. The scales had been translated by a Hungarian translator and checked and revised. All the interviews were collected, personally, between 1 September 1958 and 1 October 1959. The measures of acculturation consisted of the following: (A) The Campisi Scale for the Measurement of Acculturation, and (B) The Information Scale.

(A) *The Campisi Scale* (Campisi, 1947) is a five-point Likert-type scale consisting of six subscales giving a total of seventy-one items. The subscales are measures of associations, language usage, self-perception, food habits, desire to acculturate, and identification.

(B) *The Information Scale* was utilized because the Campisi Scale, like most self-rating scales, is subject to the criticism that respondents, however honest their intentions, might give non-veridical responses. For this reason, it was decided to include, as an additional measure of acculturation, a test designed to assess the amount and nature of information regarding aspects of American culture possessed by each respondent. It was assumed that the more acculturated respondents would be relatively more familiar with certain uniquely American expressions, and would possess more isolated bits of information about American life than would a person who was less acculturated.

The two essential differences between the Campisi Scale and the Information Scale are: (1) the Information Scale is a more objective index, i.e. the responses do not depend on the respondent's perception of his situation, but on factual knowledge; (2) the Information Index is more liable to be influenced by intelligence and education. This, however, should not be considered a contaminating factor,

for intelligence and education are very likely to influence both the rate and the extent of acculturation.

The final acculturation score for each respondent was obtained by adding the total Campisi score and the score on the Information Scale. This final score is referred to from now on as the Combined Score. The implication of unweighted adding is that the Campisi Scale is weighted about three times as heavily as the Information Scale.

## MEASURES OF INDEPENDENT AND RELATED CONTEMPORARY VARIABLES

Two types of instrument were used in obtaining data for the independent variables: (1) personality scales; (2) an interview schedule.

(1) The personality scales were used as measures of relevant personality variables.

(a) *The F Scale*. Ten items of the Christie, Howel, and Seidenberg (1958) version were used. The F Scale was given in order to determine whether authoritarian tendencies are related positively or negatively to acculturation. The F Scale was also used because recent studies have shown that it can be used to indicate certain stylistic components of behavior (Christie, *et al.*, 1958; Klein, 1960). One stylistic component is 'agreeableness', the tendency to agree with items. Another is 'scatter', a measure of the individual's tendency to agree with incompatible items. A third is 'extremity', a measure of the individual's variation around the neutral or no opinion points of the scale, i.e. does he make extreme responses? These measures were included in order to investigate whether these components were positively or negatively related to acculturation.

(b) *The V Scale* by Strodtbeck (1958) to investigate whether respondents who show a high value for achievement and mastery will be more acculturated.

(c) *A ten-item version of the Mach IV Scale* (Christie & Merton, 1958)[3] to investigate whether the respondents who are highly cynical and show strong manipulative tendencies are also high on acculturation.

(2) An extensive interview schedule, based in part on past findings, was administered to all fifty-three respondents.

## THE ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The analysis of the data collected by several of the above described instruments was undertaken separately from that of the data gathered via the questionnaire. The interrelationships among the continuous variables are depicted in the Pearsonian correlation matrix in *Table 2*.

The major body of data consists of the discrete variables yielded by the questionnaire. The interview schedule was analyzed in the following manner. First, all the respondents were ranked on the basis of the Combined Score (the Campisi score and the Information Scale score). On the basis of these rankings, the respondents were divided into three groups: high, medium, and low acculturation. For the Combined Score, the three groups were as follows: High $N$–18, Medium $N$–18, Low $N$–14. The data were trichotomized with the cutting-points made on the basis of inspection. The interview schedule, on the basis of coding categories and the use of some indices, was converted to a list of sixty-six propositions. The relationship

3. And personal communication.

**TABLE 2**

CORRELATION TABLE OF CONTINUOUS VARIABLES

| | Assoc. | Lang. | Food | Des. | S.P. | Total Camp. | Inform. Scale | F Tot. | Acq. | Scat. | Ext. | Achiev. | Mach. | Time in U.S. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Combined score | 0·80** | 0·84** | 0·71** | 0·72** | 0·85** | 0·88** | 0·51** | −0·05 | −0·17 | −0·07 | −0·03 | 0·26* | 0·33** | −0·12 |
| Association | | 0·61** | 0·39** | 0·36** | 0·56** | 0·67** | 0·37** | 0·14 | −0·08 | −0·01 | −0·01 | 0·15 | 0·28* | −0·14 |
| Language | | | 0·57** | 0·48** | 0·71** | 0·70** | 0·51** | −0·07 | −0·07 | −0·08 | 0·07 | 0·24* | 0·31* | −0·05 |
| Food habits | | | | 0·50** | 0·52** | 0·60** | 0·34** | −0·20 | −0·12 | −0·17 | −0·09 | 0·31* | 0·13 | −0·17 |
| Desire | | | | | 0·67** | 0·59** | 0·30* | −0·19 | −0·28* | −0·03 | −0·02 | 0·27* | 0·28* | −0·00 |
| Self-perception | | | | | | 0·69** | 0·48** | −0·02 | −0·09 | −0·07 | 0·00 | 0·14 | 0·30* | −0·00 |
| Campisi total | | | | | | | 0·40** | 0·11 | −0·14 | −0·02 | −0·09 | 0·21 | 0·25* | −0·17 |
| Information Scale | | | | | | | | −0·19 | −0·28* | −0·22 | −0·06 | 0·21 | 0·27* | −0·29* |
| F Total | | | | | | | | | 0·26* | −0·32* | 0·05 | −0·21 | −0·21 | 0·21 |
| Acquiescence | | | | | | | | | | 0·24** | −0·02 | −0·21 | −0·08 | 0·26* |
| Scatter | | | | | | | | | | | 0·56** | 0·20 | 0·06 | 0·15 |
| Extremity | | | | | | | | | | | | 0·18 | 0·06 | −0·02 |
| Achievement | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0·29* | −0·00 |
| Machiavelli | | | | | | | | | | | | | | −0·05 |
| Months in U.S. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

*n*=51

** indicates significance at the <·01 level
* indicates significance at the <·05 level

between these propositions and the different acculturation groups was treated by means of the chi-square discriminating power technique. The results of the analysis based on the Combined Score will be given.

# FINDINGS

### GENERAL PROBLEMS OF ANALYSIS

One of the problems of analysis concerns the time-order of variables. If it is assumed that one variable is the cause of the other, 'the variables must stand in determinate time relationship, with the assumed cause preceding the assumed effect' (Hyman, 1955, p. 193). This is an especially pertinent problem in acculturation studies. Thomas and Znaniecki (1927, p. 36) as early as 1918 recognized that 'the chief problems of social science are the problems of causal explanation'. That we have not made much headway in this area can be seen in that as late as 1960 Doob writes that most of the data on acculturation allow only for interactional relationships, not for consequential ones. He refers to these explanations as 'spiral'. In this study, the variables are separated into two major categories: prior and contemporaneous variables. Prior variables are those variables that, according to the respondent's report, occurred before he settled in the United States. In the case of these variables, a more truly causal relationship can be assumed. Contemporaneous variables are those variables that cannot be shown to have existed before the respondent's arrival in the United States. Spiro (1955) was so concerned with the problem of cause and effect that he discussed each topic both as a result and as a cause of acculturation. The following discussion will treat the nature of the relationship between acculturation and some of the other contemporaneous variables tested. (For a complete listing of variables tested, see Weinstock, 1962.)

### DISCUSSION OF SPECIFIC FINDINGS

#### I. PRIOR VARIABLES

All the prior variables are taken as independent variables possibly influencing acculturation.

### A. Demographic Variables

Of the demographic variables the following merit attention:

*1. Male respondents will acculturate faster than female respondents.* The proposition is unconfirmed. The reason why there seems to be no significant difference between males and females with regard to acculturation is probably connected with the influence of industrialization in Hungary. Among immigrants from more traditional societies like Puerto Rico (Mills *et al.*, 1950) women would be more confined to a domestic role and hence have little chance to acculturate.

*2. The amount of acculturation is influenced by the amount of time spent in the United States.* It is illuminating that this proposition was not confirmed. Since the data were collected at the time when respondents were located, there was a full year's difference between the time of interview of the first and the last respondent. It was a serious concern of the author that this artifact of data collection might vitiate whatever other findings the study might show. This obviously was not the

case. A possible explanation might be that the relationship between the amount of time spent in a given country and acculturation is not a linear one. It is most probable that there is an initial period of a few months when almost every week counts, but, after that, other factors predominate.

*3. Respondents who are Catholic will be less acculturated than respondents who are not.* This was confirmed at the $< \cdot 05$ level of significance. That Catholics acculturate more slowly was also found by Warner and Srole (1945) in Yankee City. It is suggested that the existence of a strong family tradition, an ethnic church in the United States, and the lower achievement orientation of Catholics are responsible for this finding.

*4. Jewish respondents are more acculturated than Protestant or Catholic respondents.* This finding, while not significant, is in the expected direction. All commentators report on the high acculturation of the Jewish group (Warner & Srole, 1945; Gordon, 1949; Sklare, 1958). The Jewish group is reported to be among the most acculturated ethnic groups in the United States owing to the congruence of their values with those of American culture, specifically the strong achievement orientation as reported by Strodtbeck (1958). There were no Jews in the lowest acculturated group.

## B. Propositions dealing with the Respondents' Social Origin

The propositions regarding social status, occupation, and education were based on a notion of 'successful personality'. Such a person was envisaged as having a personality that would enable him to evade the deprivations of the Communist regime and having, at the same time, the necessary education, family background, professional skills, and achievement orientation necessary to get ahead in an industrial society. It was found that respondents whose fathers' occupation was non-manual before the Communist regime acculturated faster (see *Table 3*).

TABLE 3      RESPONDENT'S FATHER'S OCCUPATION
BEFORE THE ADVENT OF THE
COMMUNIST REGIME

| Combined Scale | Manual | Non-manual | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low | 9 | 7 | 16 |
| Medium | 4 | 12 | 16 |
| High | 2 | 14 | 16 |
| Total | 15 | 33 | 48 |

$$\chi^2 = 7 \cdot 55 \qquad p < \cdot 05$$

Respondents who identified themselves as belonging to a higher social class under the Communist regime acculturated faster (see *Table 4*). Respondents whose occupation was non-manual under the Communist regime acculturated faster (see *Table 5*). Respondents accepted in the school of their choice in Communist Hungary acculturated faster ($< \cdot 05$). Respondents who were not deprived of their occupational aspiration under Communism acculturated faster (see *Table 6*). Respondents who showed strong cynical tendencies as measured by Christie's

TABLE 4          SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL CLASS UNDER
                          COMMUNISM

| Combined Scale | Upper | Lower | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low | 6 | 8 | 14 |
| Medium | 10 | 6 | 16 |
| High | 15 | 1 | 16 |
| Total | 31 | 15 | 46 |

$\chi^2 = 9 \cdot 04$     $p < \cdot 05$

TABLE 5     RESPONDENT'S OCCUPATION IN HUNGARY
                    BEFORE HIS ESCAPE (1956)

| Combined Scale | Manual | Non-manual | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low | 11 | 3 | 14 |
| Medium | 9 | 5 | 14 |
| High | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| Total | 20 | 18 | 38 |

$\chi^2 = 8 \cdot 04$     $p < \cdot 05$

TABLE 6     DEPRIVATION RELATED TO OCCUPATIONAL
                    GOAL UNDER COMMUNISM

| Combined Scale | Not deprived | Deprived | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low | 5 | 11 | 16 |
| Medium | 10 | 8 | 18 |
| High | 15 | 1 | 16 |
| Total | 30 | 20 | 50 |

$\chi^2 = 13 \cdot 21$     $p < \cdot 01$

Mach IV Scale acculturated faster (see *Table 2*); and respondents who showed high 'achievement orientation', as measured by the Strodtbeck Achievement Scale, were more acculturated (see *Table 2*). This suggests that this picture is substantially correct.

## C. The Variables relating to the Respondent's History under the Communist Regime in Hungary.

Respondents who were affected (in terms of general deprivation) by the Communist take-over will acculturate faster than respondents who were not affected. This refers to any sort of suffering under Communism, whether it affected the respondent personally or some of his close relatives. Notice the curvilinear nature of the relationship in that both the high- and the low-acculturation groups were affected more than the middle group.

TABLE 7    GENERAL DEPRIVATIONS UNDER THE
COMMUNIST REGIME

| Combined Scale | No effect | Deprived | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low | 3 | 13 | 16 |
| Medium | 10 | 8 | 18 |
| High | 2 | 14 | 16 |
| Total | 15 | 35 | 50 |

$\chi^2 = 8\cdot86$    $p < \cdot05$

## II. CONTEMPORANEOUS VARIABLES

*A. 1. Occupational mobility* (see *Tables 8* and *9*). The results confirm the widely reported finding showing a strong positive relationship between acculturation, higher social status, and social mobility (Barker, 1947; Humphrey, 1944; Senter & Hawley, 1946; Warner & Srole, 1945). Even when the entire ethnic group is predominantly of the lower class, as in the case of Puerto Ricans and the 'Norse' of Jonesville, the middle class among them are more acculturated than the lower class (Mills *et al.*, 1950; Warner 1949). Residential mobility does not seem to be related to acculturation. The reason why high social status in Hungary is related to acculturation in the United States lies in the similarity of status ascriptions of the two systems. This, however, suggests that high status is responsible for high acculturation and not vice versa.

TABLE 8    OCCUPATION AT THE TIME OF THE
INTERVIEW

| Combined Scale | Professionals & managers | Others | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low | 2 | 11 | 13 |
| Medium | 4 | 12 | 16 |
| High | 11 | 5 | 16 |
| Total | 17 | 28 | 45 |

$\chi^2 = 10\cdot40$    $p < \cdot01$

TABLE 9    AMOUNT OF OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY IN THE
UNITED STATES

| Combined Scale | Less | More | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low | 7 | 7 | 14 |
| Medium | 5 | 12 | 17 |
| High | 0 | 16 | 16 |
| Total | 12 | 35 | 47 |

$\chi^2 = 10\cdot02$    $p < \cdot01$

*2. Perception of chances for success in the United States.* Surprisingly, there seems to be no essential difference in regard to acculturation between those respondents who feel that they have a greater chance of succeeding in the United States and the respondents who feel that they have a greater chance of succeeding in Communist Hungary. This lack of difference is not due to the feeling on the part of the respondents that one cannot succeed under Communism. However, respondents who feel they have a greater chance of succeeding in the United States than in pro-Communist Hungary are more acculturated ($< \cdot 05$) (see *Table 10*).

TABLE 10  RESPONDENT'S EVALUATION OF HIS CHANCES
OF SUCCEEDING IN THE UNITED STATES
COMPARED WITH PRE-COMMUNIST HUNGARY

| Combined Scale | Less or equal here | Greater here | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low | 8 | 6 | 14 |
| Medium | 9 | 6 | 15 |
| High | 2 | 10 | 12 |
| Total | 19 | 22 | 41 |

$$\chi^2 = 6 \cdot 01 \qquad p < \cdot 05$$

## B. Education in the United States

*1. Respondents who had some education in the United States will acculturate faster than those respondents who had no education* (see *Table 11*) ($< \cdot 01$). Education in the United States is a very important factor in acculturation with regard to providing the immigrant with the necessary skills to acculturate and as an avenue of social mobility.

TABLE 11         EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

| Combined Scale | No education in the United States | Some education in the United States | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low | 15 | 1 | 16 |
| Medium | 13 | 5 | 18 |
| High | 5 | 11 | 16 |
| Total | 33 | 17 | 50 |

$$\chi^2 = 14 \cdot 38 \qquad p < \cdot 01$$

*2. Attendance at an English language course for foreigners will not lead to faster acculturation.* This suggests that the importance of language as a sufficient condition for acculturation has been exaggerated. Knowledge of a language is certainly necessary in order for one to acculturate. But one could speak fluent French in the United States and still not become a Frenchman.

## C. Residence
*1. Respondents who seek to live with Hungarians will acculturate more slowly than respondents who do not* (< ·01).

## D. Food Habits
It is usually implied that food habits are most resistant to change. This assumption is supported by learning theory and Freudian psychology, both of which hold that the earlier a habit is acquired, the more resistant it is to change. However, this contention is not supported by this study, for almost all the respondents have modified their food habits to some extent, though Hungarian food is available in the United States—at least on the Eastern Seaboard. Other considerations, namely the longer time required for preparing Hungarian food, and the richness of the food for the American climate, seem to affect the change. Child (1943), Gordon (1949), Burrows (1947), and Whyte (1943) report resistance in the change of food habits based on the fact that the immigrant continues to eat ethnic foods. Eating some foreign foods is a common American phenomenon and is in no way a sign of lack of acculturation. A more important question is what proportion of the respondent's diet consists of ethnic versus American foods. This is one of the questions considered in this study. Accordingly, *respondents whose style of cooking is Hungarian exclusively* are in the lowest acculturated group (< ·01). The Campisi Subscale dealing with food habits showed more change than did the other subscales.[4]

## E. Friendship and Family
Family and primary group. These questions dealing with friendship and family are included as an indication of some measure of social ties or roots in society. *1. Respondents who claim that they have a very close friend in the United States acculturate faster. 2. Respondents whose closest friends are American exclusively acculturate faster* (< ·01) (see *Table 12*). *3. Respondents who have three or more friends are more acculturated* (< ·05). This bears out the contention that having friends is an important factor in acculturation. *4. The influence of family status seems to have no influence on acculturation.* This is contrary to the findings of Humphrey (1944), Slotkin (1942), and Warner and Srole (1945).

TABLE 12        RESPONDENT'S CLOSEST FRIEND

| Combined Scale | Americans | Hungarians | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low | 2 | 14 | 16 |
| Medium | 8 | 8 | 16 |
| High | 13 | 3 | 16 |
| Total | 23 | 25 | 48 |

$$\chi^2 = 19 \cdot 50 \qquad p < \cdot 01$$

## F. Religious Behavior
*1. Religious behavior is negatively related to acculturation when the individual belongs to one of the ethnic churches* (< ·01) or *if his church attendance has increased*

---

4. For a study elaborating on factors influencing food habits, see Anon. (1950).

in the United States ($< \cdot05$). In *Yankee City* Warner and Srole (1945) find the Catholic Church to be an anti-acculturative influence. The same is said of the Lutheran Code of the 'Norse' of Jonesville by Warner (1949).

### G. Leisure Patterns and Interests

One of the most unexpected findings is the reported lack of influence of television on acculturation. Television is a medium of information; movies, however, seem to have more of an influence on acculturation. Respondents who read the American press exclusively are more acculturated, and respondents who read books in English exclusively are more acculturated. This demonstrates the strong influence reading has on acculturation.

### H. Values and Life Goals

This section was based on the assumption that respondents whose values are congruent with some of the dominant American values will acculturate faster than others. Ideally, it would have been desirable to ascertain the value systems of the respondents at the time of their arrival in the United States. Unfortunately, this was not feasible. However, it is the author's assumption that the successfully acculturated respondents had values similar to the dominant values of American culture before their arrival, owing to an underlying similarity of values of individuals holding high status in industrialized societies, as mentioned in the earlier theoretical section.[5]

1. *Respondents who mention hedonistic or acquisitive values as among their goals are more acculturated than those who are not too concerned with these goals ($< \cdot01$) (see Table 13).*

TABLE 13    VALUE SCHEME: ACQUISITIVE, HEDONISTIC

| Combined scale | Concerned with acquisitive values | Does not concern himself acquisitive values | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Low | 9 | 7 | 16 |
| Medium | 2 | 10 | 12 |
| High | 6 | 9 | 15 |
| Total | 17 | 26 | 43 |

$\chi^2 = 13 \cdot 15$     $p < \cdot 01$

Respondents were evaluated on the following five categories:

    a. Public and social service
    b. Patriotic and anti-Communist
    c. Familial and primary group
    d. Acquisitive and hedonistic
    e. Professional and carrier

---

5. For a discussion of how the values were measured, see Weinstock, 1962, Appendix A.

## III. PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES

A number of personality measures were introduced for the purpose of determining how personality types are related to acculturation. Scores obtained on the California F Scale or any of its stylistic measures do not seem to be related to acculturation (see *Table 2*).

*1. Respondents who have a high achievement orientation as measured by the Strodtbeck Achievement Scale are more acculturated.* This is not an unexpected finding in light of the strong emphasis American culture puts on achievement (Williams, 1960, pp. 417–21).

*2. Strong manipulative, cynical tendencies are related to high acculturation as measured by the Mach IV Scale.* This finding reinforces the stereotype that the 'hustler' type of personality will succeed fastest in our culture.

### A COMPOSITE PORTRAIT

A composite portrait of the highly acculturated Hungarian appears to be the following: his religion is either Protestant or Jewish; his father's occupation was non-manual in Hungary; he comes from the middle class in Hungary; after getting into the school of his choice under Communism his occupation was in the upper half of the occupational-prestige scale; he had at least a gymnasium education; his family suffered deprivations under Communism but he, himself, did not suffer economically. On coming to the United States, he got a job in the upper half of of the occupational-prestige scale, is generally satisfied with his job, and feels that he has had a greater chance of succeeding here than in pro-Communist Hungary. It is likely that his occupation requires some retraining and he therefore takes some school courses. He has not changed residence more than two or three times during the past three years, and he lives either alone or with his family. In his food habits, he shows a preference for American food, and, though he has some favourite Hungarian dishes, his diet is predominantly American. He has some close friends, most of whom he has met in the United States. He has most probably participated in one or two anti-Communist picketings but has not joined any Hungarian organizations. He goes to the movies rather frequently, and his main sources of information are the American press and books in English. He makes no special effort to follow developments in Hungary. He wants to settle in the United States permanently and would not go back to Hungary except for a visit, provided the political situation there had changed. Acquisitiveness and personal enjoyment are the central concerns of his existence, with a lesser emphasis on enjoying the company of family and friends. He speaks English fairly fluently, and thinks in English most of the time. As to his personality, he is an ambitious and highly cynical person, but not especially authoritarian.

## SUMMARY

This is a study of some factors that influence the acculturation of post-1956 Hungarian refugees. Fifty-three respondents were interviewed and given a number of personality measures. Two measures of acculturation were used: the Campisi Scale and an Information Scale developed by the author. The two measures were

combined to form a single index of acculturation. Thus, both self-rating and objective measures were used. In the original study over 130 propositions were tested. Some of the findings show that cynicism, high achievement orientation, and an emphasis on material possessions are positively related to acculturation. The sample includes both members of immigrant communities and those living outside of such concentrations.

Some of the findings are related to role theory, and the concept of *role elements* is developed.

## REFERENCES

ALLPORT, G. W. (1960). The open system in personality theory. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.* **3**, 301.

ANON. (1950). *Changes in food habits in the Yemenite and Iraqi Communities in Israel.* Jerusalem: The Israel Institute of Applied Social Research.

BARKER, G. C. (1947). Social functions of language in a Mexican–American community. *Acta Americana* **5**, 185–202.

BROWN, F. J. & ROUCEK, J. S. (Eds.) (1946). *One America: The history, contributions and present problems of our racial and national minorities.* (Rev. ed.) New York: Prentice-Hall.

BURROWS, E. G. (1947). *Hawaiian Americans.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

CAMPISI, P. J. (1947). A scale for the measurement of acculturation. Unpub. doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

CAUDILL, W. & DE VOS, G. (1956). Achievement, culture and personality: the case of the Japanese Americans. *Amer. Anthrop.* **58**, 1102–26.

CHILD, I. L. *Italian or American* (1943). New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

CHRISTIE, R. (1958). Education and style of thinking. Unpub. MS., Bureau of Applied Social Research.

CHRISTIE, R. & MERTON, R. K. (1958). Procedure for the sociological study of the values climate of medical schools. In Anonymous, *The ecology of the medical student.* Evanston: Association of American Medical Colleges, pp. 125–53.

DOOB, L. J. (1960). *Becoming more civilized: a psychological exploration.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

EDWARDS, A. M. (1943). *Comparative occupational statistics for the United States 1870–1940.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

FROMM, E. (1947). *Man for himself.* New York: Reinhart.

GORDON, A. I. (1949). *Jews in transition.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

GRAUMAN, R. A. (1951). Methods of studying the cultural assimilation of Immigrants. Unpub. M.Sc. thesis, London University.

HALLOWELL, I. A. (1955). *Culture and experience.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

HATT, P. K. & NORTH, C. C. (1947). Jobs and occupations: a popular evaluation. *Opin. News* **9**, 3–13.

HAWLEY, F. & SENTER, D. (1946). Group-designed behaviour patterns in two acculturating groups. *Sthwest J. Anthrop.* **2**, 133–51.

HINKLE, L. E., Jr. (1958). Motivations of individuals who took part in the uprising. In *The Hungarian Revolution of October 1956*. Second Seminar, New York: Society for the Investigation of Human Ecology.

HOFFMAN, N. N. H. (1934). *The measurement of bilingual background*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

HUMPHREY, N. D. (1944). The Detroit Mexican immigrant and naturalization. *Soc. Forces* **24**, 433–7.

HYMAN, H. (1955). *Survey design and analysis*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

INKELES, A. (1960). Industrial man: the relation of status to experience, perception, and value. *Amer. J. Sociol.* **66**, 1–31.

INKELES, A. & ROSSI, P. (1955). National comparisons of occupational prestige. *Amer. J. Sociol.* **61**, 329–39.

KEESING, F. M. (1953). *Culture-change—an analysis and bibliography of anthropological sources to 1952*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

KLEIN, E. B. (1960). Stylistic components of response as related to attitude change. Unpub. doctoral dissertation, Columbia University.

LENGYEL, F. (1948). *Americans from Hungary*. New York: Lippincott.

LINDT, G. M. (1955). The cultural assimilation of immigrants. Unpub. M.A. thesis, Columbia University.

LINTON, R. (1936). *The study of man*. New York: Appleton.

MASLOW, A. (1951). Resistance to acculturation. *J. Social Issues* **4**, 26–29.

MEAD, M. (1926). Group intelligence tests and linguistic disability among Italian children. *School and society* **24**, 465–8.

MERTON, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*. (2nd ed.) Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

MILLS, C. W. et al. (1950). *The Puerto Rican journey: New York's newest immigrants*. New York: Harper.

MURRAY, H. A. & KLUCKHOHN, C. (1953). Outline of a conception of personality. In C. Kluckhohn, H. A. Murray & D. M. Schneider (Eds.), *Personality in nature, society and culture*. (2nd ed.) New York: Knopf, pp. 3–52.

RUESCH, J., LOEB, M. B. & JACOBSON, A. (1948). Acculturation and illness. *Psychol. Monogr.*

SEGALL, M. (1961). Review of L. Doob's 'Becoming More Civilized'. *Amer. Anthrop.* **63**, pp. 655–8.

SENTER, D. & HAWLEY, F. (1946). The grammar school as the basic acculturating influence for native New Mexicans. *Soc. Forces.* **24**, 398–407.

SINGER, M. (1961). A survey of culture and personality research. In B. Kaplan (Ed.), *Studying personality cross-culturally*. Evanston: Row, Peterson, pp. 9–90.

SKLARE, M. (Ed.) (1958). *The Jews: social patterns of an American group*. Glencoe: Ill.: The Free Press.

SLOTKIN, J. S. (1942). Jewish–Gentile intermarriage in Chicago. *American sociol. Rev.* **7**, 34–9.

SPINDLER, G. (1955). *Sociocultural and psychological processes in Menomini acculturation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

SPIRO, M. E. (1955). The acculturation of American ethnic groups. *Amer. Anthrop.* **57**, 1240–52.

STEPHENSON, A. & SCHULMAN, J. (1958). *Social mobility in Communist Hungary*. Paper read at East. Sociol. Soc., Spring 1958.

STRODTBECK, F. S. (1958). Family interaction, values and achievement. In D. McClelland (Ed.), *Talent and society*. New York: Van Nostrand, pp. 135–94.

SWING, B. M. (1960) Commissioner Swing makes final report on the Hungarian Escape Program of the United States. *Interpreter Releases*, Common Council for American Unity, **352**, No. 9.

TAFT, R. (1957). A psychological model for the study of social assimilation. *Hum. Relat.* **10**, 141–57.

THOMAS, W. I. & ZNANIECKI, F. (1927). *The Polish peasant in Europe and America*. 2 vols. New York: Knopf.

WARNER, W. L. & SROLE, L. (1945). *The social system of American ethnic groups*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

WARNER, W. L. (1949). *Democracy in Jonesville*. New York: Harper.

WEINSTOCK, S. A. (1958). The composition of the CURPH 'A' interview sample. Unpub. MS., Columbia Univ. Res. Proj. on Hungary.

WEINSTOCK, S. A. (1960). Review of Borrie's 'The cultural integration of immigrants'. *Amer. J. Sociol.* **66**, 208.

WEINSTOCK, S. A. (1962). The acculturation of Hungarian immigrants: a social-psychological study. Unpub. doctoral dissertation. Columbia University.

WHYTE, W. F. (1943). *Street corner society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

WILLIAMS, R. M., Jr. (1960). *American society: a sociological interpretation.* (2nd ed.) New York: Knopf.

WSZELAKI, J. (1957). Industry. In E. C. Helmreich (Ed.), *Hungary*. New York: Praeger; London: Stevens, pp. 291–315.

## BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

S. ALEXANDER WEINSTOCK is a Research Fellow in Social Relations at Harvard University. In addition he is doing part-time psychotherapy at the Judge Baker Guidance Center in Boston. He received his Ph.D. in social psychology from Columbia University in 1962. His publications include 'Role elements—link between acculturation and occupational status' (*British Journal of Sociology*, June 1963). He is currently interested in the social psychology of culture change.